REMARKS

Claim 1 has been appropriately corrected as requested in the referenced Office Action, item 1.

Claim 18 has been amended particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention as requested in the referenced Office Action, item 3. The encoder of claims 1 and 18 were the same encoder. The encoder has been removed from claim 1.

The Examiner's rejections have been studied and considered and are addressed as follows:

Regarding item 6 of the referenced Office Action, the Examiner states in the middle of Page 4 that "it would have been obvious to have more than one trainee operating the optical device at a single time. This would allow each trainee has more training time (by not having to wait for his/her 'turn') as well as giving instructors the flexibility to compare the trainee's 'side-by-side'. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have more than one optical viewing device in the field at one time, wherein the output signals are distinguishable from each other- by frequencies transmitted by said camera control unit, for example" when discussing the Stauff reference.

Applicant contends that it would not have been obvious to have more than one trainee being monitored by a single plurality of optical monitor. In fact, monitoring of more than one trainee by an instructor is contrary to the teachings of Stauff. Stauff discloses that "during manipulations by the trainee operator 1 it will be possible for the instructor 10... to advise the trainee at all times either by a direct link or by telephone or radio link;" (See Column 4, lines 13 - 19) and that "One or more persons, whether instructors or trainees, can observe from a distance

and under good conditions what the trainee operator or operators see and can note the smallest errors between the reticule and the aiming point on the target. This continuous supervision further enables the instructors to give the necessary recommendations while the trainee is manipulating his instrument." (See Column 4, lines 45-53). For this to occur, a continuous one-to-one correspondence of trainee to remote monitoring station/trainer is required during the training period. Training trainees "side-by-side", as suggested above, would require additional complete sets of disclosed equipment and additional trainers. This necessitates that each optical viewing device be coupled with its own, dedicated remote receiver (rather than to a receiver which can distinguish between a plurality of video signals transmitted from a plurality of camera control units as is claimed in claim 1) to accomplish the task of training as described. Therefore, the addition of a system by which a remote receiver receives a plurality of signals, requiring a single instructor to divide his/her attention between a plurality of trainees would not have been obvious at the time. In fact, it would have been considered detrimental to the training method disclosed.

Regarding item 6 of the referenced Office Action, the Examiner also states in the middle of Page 5 that the disclosures in the McClenahan reference that pertain to the addition of a beam splitter and more compact video camera arrangement would be an advantage over Stauff's image system and that "it would have been obvious...to see the optical instrument device attached with a beam splitter for redirecting the image signal to the video camera disclosed by Stauff."

The Applicant cites from the Stauff reference that a key component of the Stauff system includes a "television camera fixed to the optical aiming instrument, said camera being provided with a reticle the optical axis of which is boresighted identically with said optical instrument."

(See Column 2 lines 30-33). In addition, it is disclosed that "Preferably, this reticle includes angular error marks for enabling the aiming errors made by the trainee operator to be measured on the scope" (See Column 3, lines 14-18).

The addition of the beam splitter and camera assembly as the Examiner suggests would create a situation in which the only image the camera could receive would be the one which is provided by the beam splitter. This optical image originates from the scene which is viewed through the optical instrument. The optical instrument has already in place a reticle for aiming, the optical image of which would be combined with the scene when viewed through the optical instrument. This composite optical image would then be received by the camera via the split beam path. Thus, the disclosure in the Stauff reference for the camera to be provided with its own reticle would not be practical because of the confusion that would occur from the resultant view of two reticles being sent to the monitoring station by the camera. In addition, if there would be no reticle on the camera, it would be impossible for such reticle to receive the addition of angular error marks as is the stated preferred embodiment. Therefore, the addition of the beam splitter and camera assembly as disclosed in the McClenahan reference would have been neither obvious, nor compatible with the Stauff system.

Regarding item 6 of the referenced Office Action, the Examiner also states at the bottom of Page 5, "it would have been obvious to see the camera control unit (5) includes an encoder for adding source identifying information as a unique identification code to the electronic image signal disclosed by Stauff."

The Applicant wishes to point out that, as is established above, because the Stauff system was designed to facilitate a "one camera to one receiver/trainer" mode of training for each

trainee, different frequencies of signal transmission between different transmitters and receivers would be unnecessary and useless, further, the addition of an encoder would have been meaningless and therefore neither obvious nor cost effective.

Regarding item 7 of the referenced Office Action, the Examiner states at the bottom of Page 7 that the Rod reference discloses a system wherein a video monitor can display a plurality of images simultaneously. At the top of Page 8, the Examiner asserts, "This would be an advantage over Stauff's image system in that the instructors could quickly and easily monitor the [plurality] of operators in one screen. For that reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time to see video signals are distinguishable from one another by data in an on screen display by said camera control unit disclosed by Stauff."

The Applicant wishes to point out that, the Stauff reference states "It is another important teaching of this invention that the instructor 10 has available a set of transparent grids such as the grid 13 shown in dash lines on the drawing and each bearing a mark 14 representing the size of a target of given dimensions at a given range. The instructor 10 selects the appropriate grid 13 and places it before the screen of display unit 9, in the position shown in dash lines in the drawing. Once the transparent grid 13 is in position in front of the scope, the instructor 10 can evaluate the aiming errors of trainee operator 1 and make the camera reticle 15 coincide with the grid by operating on the image framing knobs 16 of scope 9." (See Column 3 lines 48 through 61).

If more than one instructor made simultaneous use of a single monitoring scope to view and evaluate a plurality of trainees/images, including the use of a separate transparent grid by each instructor (a point which itself is impractical), it would not have been possible for each instructor to make all of the camera reticles coincide with all of the grids at the same time on the

lone monitoring scope.

For this reason, as well as the reasons cited in the first point of discussion on claim 1 above, adding a video monitor as in the Rod reference that can display a plurality of signals simultaneously to the equipment disclosed by Stauff would not have been obvious, desirable or in fact, possible.

In general, while certain elements of the present invention may be found in the prior art, the combination of those elements to form the whole of the system as claimed herein is unique.

Applicant requests the foregoing amendments be made to the application and that the application be passed to issue. In the event the Examiner believes a conference would serve to advance the prosecution of this application in any way, the undersigned attorney is available at the number noted below.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph J. Zito, Reg. No. 32,076
ZITO tlp
26005 Ridge Road, Suite 203
Damascus, MD 20872
(301) 601-5010

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on May 29, 2003.

Joseph J. Zito — 5-29-03 Date